UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, V. Plaintiff, Second Endows Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15) Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///		Case 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB Documer	nt 17 Filed 01/06/25 Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, V. A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	1		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, STRICT OF CALIFORNIA No. 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB (PC) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., (ECF No. 15) Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.)	2		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, V. Plaintiff, Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, No. 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB (PC) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDATION	3		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, STINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) M// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	4		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, No. 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB (PC) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., (ECF No. 15) Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	5		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, V. A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	6		
BEASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	7		
MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, V. A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, No. 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB (PC) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) ///	9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
Plaintiff, v. A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) ///	10		
RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., (ECF No. 15) Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) ///	11	MICHAEL OWEN GARDNER,	No. 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB (PC)
CERTAIN DEFENDANTS A. MELERO, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) ///	12	Plaintiff,	
Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	13	V.	
Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	14	A. MELERO, et al.,	(ECF No. 15)
Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	15	Defendants.	
U.S.C. § 1983. On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	16		
On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// /// /// ///	17	Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42	
that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// ///		U.S.C. § 1983.	
Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No. 15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// ///		On December 5, 2024, the Court screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and found	
15.) However, Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim against any other named Defendants. Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// 28		that he stated a cognizable claim for deliberate indifference to safety against Defendants Hyatt,	
Plaintiff was granted the opportunity to file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (Id.) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// ///		Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and Melero. (ECF No.	
intent to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable. (<u>Id.</u>) On January 2, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// /// /// /// ///			
notice of intent to proceed on the claim found to be cognizable. (ECF No. 10.) /// /// /// 28			
26			
27 /// 28			
28			
		///	
$_{ m II}$	28		1

Case 1:24-cv-00933-JLT-SAB Document 17 Filed 01/06/25 Page 2 of 2

Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- This action proceed on Plaintiff's deliberate indifference claim against Defendants
 Hyatt, Alvardo, Geels, Guzman-Ramirez, Guillen, Torres-Rocha, D. Martinez, and
 Melero; and
- 2. All other Defendants be dismissed from the action for failure to state a cognizable claim for relief.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within **fourteen** (**14**) **days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written objections with the Court, limited to 15 pages, including exhibits. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing <u>Baxter v. Sullivan</u>, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: **January 6, 2025**

STANLEY A. BOONE

United States Magistrate Judge